

PATENT

D. REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-21 were present in the Application prior to this Response. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, and 19 have been amended, claims 2, 9, and 15 have been cancelled, and new independent claim 21 has been added. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments and additions. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, and 16-21 are currently pending in the Application.

Examiner Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' attorney during a telephone interview on May 10, 2005. During the interview, independent claims 1 and 21 were discussed with regard to the Shrader reference (discussed in more detail below). Applicants pointed out that Shrader does not define a new active credential if one is not found. The Examiner suggested that it may be helpful for Applicants to specifically claim where the new active credential is created, and Applicants' attorney agreed to consider this suggestion. No agreement was reached during the interview.

Drawings

The Office Action did not indicate whether the formal drawings filed by the Applicants are accepted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate whether the drawings filed on January 9, 2002 are accepted by the Examiner in the next communication.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification has been amended to correct minor,

Docket No. AUS920010912US1

Page 11 of 18

Atty Ref. No. IBM-1048

Chang, et. al. - 10/042,495

PATENT

inadvertant typographical errors.

Claim Rejections - Alleged Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shrader, U.S. Patent No. 6,851,060 (hereinafter Shrader). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim (Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2131). Applicants respectfully submit that Shrader does not teach, and further does not suggest, all the elements of Applicants' independent claims, as amended.

As detailed in independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 21, Applicants teach and claim receiving a resource request at a client computer. An association table, accessible from the client computer and including a plurality of active credentials, is searched to determine if an applicable active credential is found. If an applicable active credential is found, the applicable active credential is retrieved from the association table and used to access the requested resource. As described in Applicants' specification on page 4, lines 7-18, an active credential includes information such as user id and password information.

Shrader discloses a mechanism that dynamically presents basic authentication and cookie information to a web browser user (see Abstract). Shrader does not teach or suggest "searching an association table accessible from the client computer, the association table containing a plurality of stored active credentials," as taught and claimed by Applicants in amended, independent claims 1, 8, and 14, and new independent claim 21. Further, Shrader does not teach or suggest

PATENT

"determining if an applicable active credential is found in the association table," and, if so, "retrieving the applicable active credential" and "accessing the requested resource using the retrieved applicable active credential." The portion of Shrader cited by the Examiner, i.e. Fig. 7, step 405, merely shows a browser checking to see if a requested URL has domain and path entries in a Cookie Table (col. 7, lines 10-11). A Cookie Table "stores entries related to cookies stored by the web browser on behalf of given web servers" (col. 5, lines 37-39). Those skilled in the art understand that a cookie is a packet of information that is sent from a web browser to a web server each time the web browser accesses the same server. **A cookie is used to return the same information to a server that was previously sent from the server to the client.** Cookies are typically used to maintain state between HTTP transactions.

Finding a cookie in a Cookie Table and sending it to a web server, as disclosed by Shrader, is simply not the same as "searching an association table" to determine "if an applicable active credential is found," and, if so, "accessing the requested resource using the retrieved applicable active credential," as taught and claimed by Applicants.

Shrader stores cookies in a Cookie Table so that users can view and modify cookie data (col. 7, lines 53-55). Shrader is not concerned with identifying and retrieving active credentials used to access requested resources, which is the situation Applicants are addressing with their unique method, system, and program product.

Independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 further claim that the client computer defines "a new active credential" if it determines "that the applicable active credential is not found." As claimed in the independent claims, if the client computer

Docket No. AUS920010912US1

Page 13 of 18

Atty Ref. No. IBM-1048

Chang, et. al. - 10/042,495

PATENT

does not find an applicable active credential in the association table, the client computer defines a new active credential. The Examiner cites Shrader at col. 7, lines 15-20 as teaching this aspect of Applicants' claims. However, Shrader specifically states that if there are no cookies in the Cookie Table, "the web browser sends the URL request **without cookie data** to the web server" (col. 7, lines 15-20, emphasis added). This is in direct contrast to what is taught and claimed by Applicants. Applicants do not send a resource request without an active credential. Rather, as taught and claimed by Applicants in independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 21, if an active credential is not found in the association table, a new active credential is defined by the client computer. By sending a URL request without cookie data, Shrader actually teaches away from "defining a new active credential in response to not identifying the active credential," as taught and claimed by Applicants.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 21, and the claims which depend from them, are not anticipated by, and are patentable over, Shrader.

Notwithstanding the patentability of all claims in the Application, as discussed above, Applicants would like to further discuss some of the dependent claims below.

Dependent claims 3, 10, and 16 further claim that "the applicable active credential includes a dynamic data field." The Examiner cites Shrader, Figure 2, data fields 112, 114, 116, 118, 120, and 124 as being active data fields. This is simply not true. Data fields 112-124 are clearly static data fields that do not contain any dynamic data.

Dependent claims 4, 11, and 17 add the elements of "accepting authorization data corresponding to a network

Docket No. AUS920010912US1

Page 14 of 18

Atty Ref. No. IBM-1048

Chang, et. al. - 10/042,495

PATENT

connection," "determining whether the authorization data includes **dynamic data**," and "storing a **dynamic data description** based on the determination." The Examiner cites Shrader's Fig. 7, steps 412 and 417 as disclosing these elements. However, these steps merely show that a browser may receive cookie data, which may or may not be accepted by a user (col. 7, lines 29-32). Whether or not a user accepts cookies has nothing to do with determining whether authorization data includes dynamic data, and, if so, then storing a dynamic description, as taught and claimed by Applicants. Shrader is simply not dealing with dynamic data, but rather with static data.

As discussed fully in Applicants' specification, and as specifically claimed in dependent claims 5, 12, and 18, a user is prompted for "dynamic input based on the dynamic data description," and the dynamic input is then stored "in the dynamic data field within the applicable active credential." The Examiner cites Shrader, Fig. 5, as teaching "prompting a user for dynamic input based on the dynamic data description." However, Fig. 5 actually shows a user input screen which allows a user to **modify the static data** stored within a cookie. Once the modified data is stored, it is static, i.e. it remains the same. Shrader does not teach or suggest "storing the dynamic input in the dynamic data field within the applicable active credential," as taught and claimed by Applicants. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit the dependent claims 4-5, 11-12, and 17-18, are not anticipated by, and are patentable over, Shrader.

With regard to new, independent claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that Shrader does not teach or suggest many of the elements. As discussed above, Shrader is concerned with allowing a user to browse and modify cookies. Therefore,

Docket No. AUS920010912US1

Page 15 of 18

Atty Ref. No. IBM-1048

Chang, et. al. - 10/042,495

PATENT

Shrader does not teach or suggest "*searching an association table accessible from the client computer, the association table containing a plurality of stored active credentials*, wherein each active credential includes one or more definition fields, and wherein the definition fields are selected from the group consisting of a domain name, a server name, a user id, and a password." Shrader further does not teach or suggest "*determining if an applicable active credential is found in the association table, wherein the applicable active credential corresponds to the resource request*."

As discussed in detail above, Shrader does not teach or suggest "*defining, by the client computer, a new active credential*" in response to determining that an applicable active credential is not found in the association table. Shrader specifically states that if there are no cookies in the Cookie Table, "*the web browser sends the URL request without cookie data to the web server*" (col. 7, lines 15-20, emphasis added). This is in direct contrast to what is taught and claimed by Applicants in new, independent claim 21. Applicants do not send a resource request without an active credential. Rather, if an applicable active credential is not found in the association table, a new active credential is defined by the client computer. By sending a URL request without cookie data, Shrader actually teaches away from "*defining a new active credential*," as taught and claimed by Applicants.

Also, as discussed in detail above, with regard to dependent claims 4-5, 11-12, and 17-18, Shrader does not teach or suggest at least the following elements of new independent claim 21, having to do with dynamic data:

- determining whether the applicable active credential includes a dynamic data field;

Docket No. AUS920010912US1

Page 16 of 18

Atty Ref. No. IBM-1048

Chang, et. al. - 10/042,495

PATENT

- in response to determining that the applicable active credential includes the dynamic data field, prompting a user for dynamic input based on a dynamic data description;
- in response to the prompting, storing the dynamic input in the dynamic data field within the applicable active credential;

As discussed above, Shrader does not address the issue of dynamic data. The data fields depicted in Shrader's Fig. 2, i.e. data fields 112, 114, 116, 118, 120, and 124, are clearly static data fields that do not contain any dynamic data.

Shrader further discloses that a browser may receive cookie data, which may or may not be accepted by a user (col. 7, lines 29-32). As shown in Shrader's Fig. 5, a user is allowed to **modify the static data** stored within a cookie, using a user input screen. Once the modified data is stored, it is static, i.e. it remains the same. Shrader does not teach or suggest "determining whether the applicable active credential includes a **dynamic data field**," "prompting a user for **dynamic input** based on a **dynamic data description**," and "storing the **dynamic input** in the **dynamic data field** within the applicable active credential," as taught and claimed by Applicants in new, independent claim 21.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 21 is patentable over Shrader.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, and 16-21 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

PATENT

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By Leslie A. Van Leeuwen
Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196
Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorneys for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742

Docket No. AUS920010912US1

Page 18 of 18
Chang, et. al. - 10/042,495

Atty Ref. No. IBM-1048